



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,156	04/02/2004	Vincent Carmelo Bruzzese	IGT1P145/P-267 DIV CIP	1189

22434 7590 06/05/2007  
BEYER WEAVER LLP  
P.O. BOX 70250  
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER
----------

TORIMIRO, ADETOKUNBO OLUSEGUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

.3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/05/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/817,156	BRUZZESE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Adetokunbo O. Torimiro	3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Adetokunbo O. Torimiro.

(3) R. Mahboubian.

(2) Kim Nguyen.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wells et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**KIM NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

The Attorney argued that the prior art Wells et al teaches the limitation of claim 1 except the rejection that the hand held portable transponder as claimed is not the same as the laptop (128) as discussed in the prior art. The Examiner points out to the Applicant that besides the laptop being a portable hand held device, it performs the function of transmitting and receiveing as discussed in the reference as downloading. The applicant also argued that the teaching of Wells et al fails to teach control signals as claimed in claim 5. Although the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant by pointing out that sending control signals is an obvious part of transmitting and receiveing / downloading as used in the claim and reference prior art, the Examiner will consider the Applicant's argument comprehensively.